

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2, 13, 22, 23, 25, 26, 30-33, and 35 have been amended, and claim 1 has been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 2-12 have been indicated as including allowable features, and would be allowed if rewritten into independent form. Accordingly, claim 2 has been amended into independent form. Similarly, claims 32-33 and 35 have been amended to include similar subject matter as that of claim 2. Further, withdrawn claim 13 has also been amended into independent form.

Claims 2-35 are pending, with claims 2-12, 22, 25, 26, and 30-35 being under consideration.

RESTRICTION/ELECTION

Claims 13-21, 22, 24, and 27-29 currently stand withdrawn from consideration.

However, in view of the above amendments to the withdrawn claims, applicants respectfully request that this election requirement be reconsidered.

Here, it is further noted that withdrawn claims 22, 25, and 26-29 now depend from allowable claim 2. In addition, withdrawn claim 13 has been amended into independent form. Features of withdrawn claim 13 are similar, with differing scope and breadth, as those of allowable features in claim 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is similarly patentably distinguishable over the cited art, and thus, in allowable condition.

Rejoinder of the withdrawn claims is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 102

Claims 31, 32, and 35 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Hull, U.S. Patent No. 1,761,040. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 31 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 2, and claims 32 and 35 have been amended to include features similar as those of claim 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 31, 32 and 35 are equally in allowable condition.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 31, 32, and 35 are patentably distinguishable over Hull. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 103

Claims 25, 26, and 30-35 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being obvious over Gidseg, U.S. Patent No. 4,776,182, in view of Hull (both U.S. Patent Nos. 1,761,040 and 1,780,425). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 25, 26, 30, and 31 have been amended to depend from allowable claim 2, and claims 32, 33, and 35 have been amended to include features similar as those of claim 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 25, 26, and 30-35 are equally in allowable condition.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 25, 26, and 30-35 are patentably distinguishable over Hull. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over the Gidseg/Hull combination, in view of Lee. U.S. Patent No. 5,826,442.

As claim 22 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 2, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

In view of the above amendments to claims 22, 25, 26, and 30-35, withdrawal of the outstanding obviousness-type double patenting rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.


Serial No. 10/687,673

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 5/16/06

By: 

Stephen T. Boughner
Registration No. 45,317

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501